Bryan, Joseph (DEQ)

From: Peggy Sanner <PSanner@cbf.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2016 12:01 PM
To: Chesterfield Power Station Water Permit (DEQ); joseph.bryan@virginia.deq.gov; Winter, Kyle (DEQ)
Cc: Rebecca LePrell; Chris Moore; Joseph Wood
Subject: Comments of CBF on Chesterfield Power Station VPDES Permit (reissuance)
Attachments: Chesterfield VPDES cmmts 7-21-16 fnl.pdf

Dear Mr. Bryan and Mr. Winter,

Kindly find attached the comments of Chesapeake Bay Foundation concerning the draft VPDES permit reissuance for the Chesterfield Power Station. Please let us know of any comments. I would also appreciate confirmation that you have received these comments.

Best regards,
Peggy

Margaret L. (Peggy) Sanner
Virginia Assistant Director and Senior Attorney
Chesapeake Bay Foundation
1108 E. Main Street, Suite 1600
Richmond, VA 23219
804.780.1392 (x 3060)
804.543.9768 (cell)

July 21, 2016

Joseph Bryan
DEQ – Piedmont Regional Office
4949-A Cox Road
Glen Allen, VA 23060
ChesterfieldPowerStationWaterPermit@deq.virginia.gov

Re: Virginia Electric and Power Company D/B/A Dominion Virginia Power Chesterfield Power Station VPDES Permit No. VA0004146 (Reissuance)

Dear Mr. Bryan:

On behalf of the Chesapeake Bay Foundation (CBF), I hereby submit the following comments regarding the draft Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (VPDES) Permit No. VA0004146 (reissuance) for Virginia Electric and Power Company d/b/a Dominion Virginia Power's ("Dominion") Chesterfield Power Station (CPS).

CBF is the largest regional nonprofit organization dedicated solely to saving the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries, including the James River. With over 200,000 members, including approximately 70,000 in Virginia, CBF has offices in Richmond and Virginia Beach; conducts restoration activities on the James River, at CBF's oyster restoration center in Gloucester and other locations throughout the watershed; and operates award winning on-the-water education programs for students, teachers and administrators from its island centers in the Chesapeake Bay and through boat-centered programs on the James and other tributary waterways.

Dominion's plans to close the CPS coal ash ponds following the promulgation of the Electric Utilities Final Coal Combustion Residuals Rule, issued April 2015 ("CCR Rule")[1] have wide implications for the water quality and habitat of the James River and the Chesapeake Bay, both ravaged by, and now recovering from, years of industrial and other pollution. Accordingly, CBF commented to the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) on the draft Chesterfield Power Station Fossil Fuel Combustion Products Management Landfill Permit (Solid Waste Permit No. 609) and to the Chesterfield County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors regarding modification of Dominion's Conditional Use Permit for the CPS. We respectfully offer the present comments on the draft VPDES permit to help protect the James and the Bay from pollution both from ongoing generating operations and from the intended closure of the two coal ash impoundments on the CPS site.

[1] Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals from Electric Utilities, 40 C.F.R. § 257,61 (2015).

We are grateful to have had the opportunity to discuss many of the closure issues with representatives of Dominion, and for the tour of the CPS facility provided by Dominion. We appreciate the significant efforts of Dominion and DEQ to protect these waterways.

BACKGROUND

This reissued Permit will regulate ongoing discharges to surface waters from the coal- and gas-fired generation of electricity at CPS. The Permit will also address new discharges arising from the anticipated closure of two coal ash ponds and other operational modifications occasioned by the recent CCR Rule.

The CPS operation currently makes use of a number of internal and external outfalls that discharge to the James River, Farrar Gut and Aiken Swamp; planned pond closure activities are expected to change these flow patterns in some respects. For example, the Lower Ash Pond (LAP), which currently receives wet sluiced ash and wastewater from various sources at the facility, now discharges the freestanding wastewater to the James through Outfall 004; the dewatered wet ash is then transported to the Upper Ash Pond (UAP) for treatment. To facilitate pond closure, CPS will construct a Low Volume Wastewater Treatment System (LVWWTS) to treat the wastewater that is currently routed to the LAP and then discharge it first to internal Outfall 301 and subsequently through a diffuser to the thermal discharge channel for Outfall 003. Once the operational conversion is complete and the LVWWTS is receiving and treating wastewater, the LAP and UAP will be closed.

During pond drawdown and dewatering, approximately 280 million gallons of wastewater will be pumped from the LAP over a three-month period and approximately 3.5 million gallons of wastewater from the UAP will be discharged[2] over a one-month period through internal Outfall 101 and then to the James through Outfalls 001 or 002. This enormous volume of wastewater will have the "highest concentrations of pollutants as it has the closest contacts with the CCRs"[3]**.**

COMMENTS

CBF's comments address certain of the CPS discharges -- pre-drawdown and planned in connection with the LAP and UAP closures -- to be regulated by the Permit.

I. Ensuring Nutrient and Sediment Discharges Conform to Chesapeake Bay TMDL and Virginia Watershed Implementation Plan Requirements

In 2010, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued the *Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load for Nitrogen, Phosphorus and Sediment* (Bay TMDL)[4]; this document, together with Virginia's Phase I Watershed Implementation Plan (Phase I WIP) and the similar plans prepared by other watershed jurisdictions, comprise the blueprint ("Blueprint") for restoring the Bay and its tributary rivers

[2] *See* VPDES Permit No. VA0004146 Fact Sheet at 5.
[3] *Id.* at 15.
[4] See https://www.epa.gov/chesapeake-bay-tmdl/chesapeake-bay-tmdl-document.

by 2025. The Blueprint states specific nutrient and sediment limits for all major industrial operations that discharge to the waterways flowing to the Bay.

Nutrients. In Virginia, Blueprint-compliant nutrient limits are made binding on individual dischargers – including CPS – through incorporation into the VPDES Watershed General Permit (WGP) for Nutrients and the Water Quality Management Planning Regulation.[5] The nutrient limits assigned to the CPS by the WGP are fully incorporated into the draft (individual) Permit and govern all discharges to the James River, Farrar Gut and Aiken Swamp. For example, the nutrient limits for the facility set forth in the WGP and the Registration Statement govern pre-drawdown discharges from CPS's Outfall 004 (ash sluice water, bottom ash and stormwater landing on the LAP) and Outfall 005 (stormwater from the UAP). Those Blueprint-compliant limits will also govern closure-related discharges. Thus, during closure, UAP and LAP effluent will be discharged through outfall 101 (internal) and then to external Outfall 001 or 002, which are expressly subject to the nutrient limits enforced by the Watershed General Permit and Registration Statement.[6] Similarly, the LVWWTS that will receive and treat wastewater after closure of the LAP and the UAP will be subject to the nutrient limits of the WGP.

Sediment. The Blueprint contemplates that existing Virginia point sources will conform to federal regulations prescribing technology-based (Best Practicable Control Technology, or BPT) for sediment.[7] These regulations prescribe daily TSS limits of 100 mg/L (30 mg/L monthly average) for low volume wastes,[8] fly ash and bottom ash transport water, and metal cleaning wastes. By contrast, for coal pile runoff, the daily TSS limit is 50 mg/L (30 mg/L monthly average). For waste streams comprised of different sources, applicable limits are calculated using the limit for each stream times the percentage of that waste in the combined stream. These rules apply except where there are "fundamentally different factors" at play than those contemplated by the TSS technology limits prescribed in the rule. [9]

The Permit prescribes these limits for pre-drawdown activities. Thus, most CPS outfalls are generally subject to the standard 100 mg/L (30 mg/L) TSS limits, while the Permit also prescribes a *calculated* daily TSS limit of 88 mg/L (30 mg/L) for Outfall 004 that takes into account the different regulatory limits applicable to each waste stream in the LAP wastewater that discharges at this Outfall (low volume waste streams including metal cleaning wastewater, treated FGD wastewater, and wastewater from LAP toe drains). [10] The Fact Sheet indicates that the permittee has achieved this somewhat more stringent TSS limit.[11]

---

[5] Outfalls subject to TMDL and covered by WGP: 004 (LAP to Farrar Gut); 005 (UAP to Farrar Gut); Outfall 101 (during dewatering UAP, LAP); 301 (LVWWTS new internal).
[6] VPDES Permit No. VA0004146 at 4.
[7] *See* 40 C.F.R. 423.12.
[8] Citing 40 C.F.R § 423.11(b). Defines "low volume waste sources" to mean, taken collectively as if from one source, "wastewater from all sources except those for which specific limitations are otherwise established in this part. Low volume wastes sources include, but are not limited to: wastewaters from wet scrubber air pollution control systems, ion exchange water treatment system, water treatment evaporator blowdown, laboratory and sampling streams, boiler blowdown, floor drains, cooling tower basin cleaning wastes, and recirculating house service water systems. Sanitary and air conditioning wastes are not included. . ."
[9] *See* 40 C.F.R. 423.12.
[10] Permit at 14.
[11] Fact Sheet at 19.

It is not clear, however, that the TSS limits applicable during drawdown activities are consistent with the federal rule's calculation requirements. As noted above, during closure, wastewater from the LAP (a combined wastewater stream) and UAP will both be discharged through internal Outfall 101 (and then to external Outfalls 001 or 002); the discharge should, therefore be considered a combined waste stream requiring a calculated TSS limit. Yet, the Permit simply prescribes the standard 100 mg/L (30 mg/L) TSS limit. [12] Use of this standard TSS limit appears inconsistent with the federal rule.

Moreover, the anticipated discharge from Outfall 101 during closure activities should be deemed "fundamentally different factors" than those contemplated in the rule. Thus, the very high volume of wastewater (more than 280 million gallons) anticipated to be discharged from Outfall 101 indicates that a lower TSS concentration limit is appropriate to ensure protection for the receiving waters.[13]

Recommendation #1:

The draft Permit should be modified to reduce the TSS maximum daily limit for discharges from Outfall 101 during closure activities. The new lower TSS limits should reflect the constituent wastewater from the LAP and UAP, and also ensure protection of the receiving waters.

Phase III Watershed Implementation Plan. In 2018, EPA and the Bay states are expected to update the Blueprint documents and strategies, taking into account progress and remaining challenges toward the 2025 restoration goal. Accordingly, it is appropriate that the Permit include Special Condition I.C.2 ("Nutrient Reopener") which expressly allows for the Permit to be reopened for new limitations, monitoring requirements or other changes that may be necessitated by State Water Control Board (Board) action on new nutrient standards, including for the Chesapeake Bay. The draft Permit does not include any Special Condition providing for reopening to address changes in sediment discharge limits.

Recommendation #2:

The draft Permit should be amended to add a new Special Condition ("Sediment Reopener") to address any changes to sediment limits required by Blueprint modifications after 2018.[14]

II. Ensuring Effective Stormwater Management During Closure Activities

While industrial stormwater from CPS to surrounding waterways is generally regulated under the VPDES Industrial Stormwater General Permit,[15] rather than this individual Permit, this Permit will directly regulate discharges occasioned by the massive operational changes related to ash pond closures: ash movement for off-site disposal, ash loading and unloading, ash storage prior to offsite transport, and vehicle tracking. It is appropriate, therefore, that this Permit include Special Condition I.C.23, "Ash Pond Closure Stormwater Management," which requires maintenance of a Stormwater

[12] Permit at 9.
[13] Thus, closure activities should constitute "fundamentally different factors" than those contemplated by the TSS technology limits prescribed by 40 C.F.R. 423.12(a).
[14] Documentation of nutrient/ammonia limitations – Attachment 5a through 5f.[14]
[15] Fact Sheet, attachment 3 (Form 2C – NPDES).

Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that mandates stormwater BMPs. Given the scale of the operational changes, we do not think the Permit's required inspection schedule for these BMPs is adequate.

Recommendation #3:

The Permit should be modified at Special Condition to I.C.23 to require the permittee to conduct inspections of the structural efficiency and operational integrity of each BMP *every three days* during closure activities.[16]

III. Required Pre-Discharge Treatment of LAP & UAP Wastewater

This draft Permit states effluent limitations for more than 20 pollutants expected to be found in the wastewater from LAP and UAP decanting and dewatering pre-treatment prior to discharge to meet those limits, enhanced pre-discharge treatment of treated wastewater that exceeds stated trigger concentrations, and inline process sampling collected every four hours[17] during discharge to determine pollutant concentrations.[18]

The draft Permit does not specify the treatment process that must be used for the effluent from the LAP and the UAP. [19] Instead, CPS must develop, and submit to DEQ for approval, a Concept Engineering Report (CER) detailing the planned wastewater treatment that will achieve design treatment and effluent concentrations. [20] The Permit also requires submission to DEQ of a monthly summary report of the decanting/dewatering discharge no later than the 10th day of the month after monitoring takes place, authorizes DEQ to include technology-based annual effluent limits based on the information in the CER, and requires Dominion, *when requested*, to furnish DEQ information showing the effects of discharging UAP and LAP wastewater on the quality of state waters.[21] Noncompliance with the approved CER will be a violation of the Permit.[22]

Recommendations #4-8:

The draft Permit should be modified to require public comment on the submitted CER before it is approved by DEQ. This CER will effectively be incorporated into the Permit and must therefore be subject to the public participation standards applicable to all NPDES permits which will serve, among other things, to ensure that the treatment being proposed will meet the technology requirement of the Clean Water Act.

---

[16] Permit at 33 (C.23.)
[17] Permit at 32.
[18] Permit I.C.21 ("Treatment Requirements for the Lower Ash Pond and the Upper Ash Pond Closure Discharge") at 32.
[19] *See* Permit Special Condition I.C.8.
[20] Fact Sheet at 4-5 ("All discharge flows during closure will be treated prior to closure. A concept engineering report for the treatment process must be submitted and approved prior to construction").
[21] *See* Fact Sheet at 25 (citing to Va. Code § 62.1-44.21 for authority).
[22] Permit at 32.

Similarly, the draft Permit should be modified to require public comment on any proposal to modify, revoke or reissue the Permit by adding annual concentration limits.[23]

The draft Permit should be modified to require CPS to submit the inline decanting/dewatering sampling reports to DEQ on a continuous or real-time basis, without waiting for a request. This step will ensure DEQ can be proactive in addressing any arising problems that may threaten state waters – a critical ability, given the short term nature of the pond discharge process and the potentially grave impacts on receiving waterways from violations, accidents or unforeseen problems.

The draft Permit should also be modified to require CPS to provide for public access to the results of the inline sampling processes within a timeframe as close to real time as possible. Early, regular and accessible information on these discharges is imperative to maintain public trust.

IV. Investigating & Mitigating Any Surface Water Pollution from LAP and UAP Leachate.

The draft Permit requires continued groundwater sampling pursuant to an existing groundwater monitoring plan dated September 2001, modified in November 2001, which has been incorporated into the Permit,[24] and the portions of the monitoring plan that address the UAP and the LAP will remain in effect until they are superseded by a Solid Waste permit.[25] Yet, new information suggests that these provisions may not be sufficient to protect Virginia's ground and surface waters from pollution traceable to the coal ash ponds.

In a recently published study, [26] Duke University scientists examined the geochemistry of ground and surface waters from different coal ash storage sites, including CPS, in 5 states.[27] Previous studies had found that coal ash leachates have distinctive boron and strontium isotope ratios. This study relied on isotopic signatures to delineate CCR impacts in the environment, sampling sites with no earlier known contamination from accidental releases. At CPS and other sites, the study found high boron and strontium concentrations, along with distinctly low CCR-typical isotopes of boron values, that the researchers concluded are evidence for the discharge of coal ash pond water to local surface water.[28] The study also found similar evidence at the site of closed coal ash ponds, suggesting that the process of leaching to ground and then to surface water may not stop upon pond closure.

---

[23] *See* Permit Special Condition I.C.20 (requiring DEQ approval of submitted CER, and authorizing DEQ to initiate technology-based annual concentration limits).
[24] Permit at 23.
[25] Permit Special Condition 1.C.7 "Groundwater Monitoring." 62.1-44.21. Relies on existing schedule until new RCRA permit supersedes the monitoring plan. Permit Attachment 8.
[26] Jennifer S. Harkness, Barry Sulkin & Avner Vengosh, Evidence for Coal Ash Ponds Leaking in the Southeastern United States, 50 Environ. Sci. Technol., 6,583,92 (2016).
[27] *See Id.*
[28] *Id*. at E.

This study is preliminary. Yet its results clearly suggest that leachate from CPR's coal ash ponds may be traveling to surface waters surrounding the CPS facility. In such case, the CPS coal ash ponds – existing or closed – may constitute a point source of pollutants to the James River and/or local waterways.[29] Such a discharge, unless duly permitted by the Board, would be illegal. Given these circumstances, the Permit may not be issued in its present form, consistent with the responsibilities of DEQ and the Board.

Recommendation #9:

The draft Permit should be modified to require CPS to investigate the possible discharge to surface waters of pollutants from the LAP and/or UAP using the methodology described in the Duke study; and, if such discharges are detected, to develop and submit to DEQ for approval a treatment process to prevent such discharge from its coal ash sources; and to implement the plan within the Permit period pursuant to an appropriate compliance schedule. Opportunities for public review of the investigation process and for public comment on the proposed treatment plan should be required.

V. Ensuring CPS Operations Do Not Harm Wildlife and Habitat

A. Proposed Thermal Variance under CWA 316(a)

The draft Permit proposes to carry forward the thermal variance first granted to CPS in 2004, with the explanation that "station operations have not materially changed" since 2004 and that there is "no evidence that the stream characteristics have materially changed" since that time.[30] The variance would allow CPS to continue discharging heated cooling water into Farrar Gut. New information concerning Atlantic Sturgeon in the James River strongly indicates, however, that the requested variance should be denied until CPS updates the study materials it submitted to DEQ in 2004 with the goal of taking into account the 2011 listing of Atlantic Sturgeon as an endangered species and the pending administrative rulemaking to designate critical habitat as it pertains to the Chesapeake Bay distinct population segment.

CWA Section 316(a) authorizes DEQ to impose less stringent effluent limitations to control thermal discharges if the permittee demonstrates that the otherwise applicable effluent limit is more stringent than necessary "to assure the protection and propagation of a balanced, indigenous population [BIP] of shellfish, fish, and wildlife in and on the body of water into which the discharge is to be made."[31] The burden is on the permittee to show that variance will assure protection of the BIP, considering the "cumulative impact of the thermal discharge together with all other significant impacts on the species affected."[32] It does not appear that CPS has met its burden.

---

[29] *See Sierra Club v. Dominion Virginia Power*, No. 2:2015cv00112 (E.D. VA. 2015). In this case, the federal court is directly considering the question whether coal ash ponds are point sources of pollution to surface waters that must be regulated through Clean Water Act permits.
[30] Fact Sheet, Attachment 7.
[31] 40 C.F.R. §§ 125.72- 125.73.
[32] 40 C.F.R § 125.73(a).

On June 3, 2016, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) published for public comment a proposed rule regarding Atlantic Sturgeon, "Endangered and Threatened Species; [33] Designation of Critical Habitat for the Gulf of Maine, New York Bight, and Chesapeake Bay Distinct Population Segments of Atlantic Sturgeon."[34] The specific areas proposed for designation include approximately 453 miles of aquatic habitat for the Chesapeake Bay Atlantic Sturgeon population segment in the Bay region, including the James River. Critical habitat includes the geographic areas with the physical or biological features essential to the species' conservation of the species. Special management considerations or protections, including in NPDES permits, may be required.[35]

Recommendation #10:

The draft Permit should be modified to require CPS to update its prior submissions in support of the thermal variance to take into account the current state of science on potential impacts to Atlantic Sturgeon from anticipated thermal discharges.

B. Cooling Water Intake Under CWA 316(b)

The draft Permit includes an extended schedule for CPS to submit information demonstrating its compliance with new federal requirements to minimize impingement and entrainment of aquatic organisms in connection with its intake of cooling water.

On August 15, 2014, EPA signed the final regulatory revisions under CWA 316(b) which require facilities, like CPS, with water intake structures designed to withdraw 2 MGD to minimize impingement and entrainment mortality and adverse impacts to aquatic organisms by implementing Best Technology Available (BTA). For permits to be issued before July 15, 2018, the permittee must submit documentation demonstrating compliance with the rule's BTA options.[36] CPS requested, and the draft Permit would grant, an extension until 270 days before the end of the Permit term, within which to supply documentation showing that it has met the BTA requirements. The extension of time will allow CPS to conduct a two-year Entrainment Study, a Comprehensive Technology and Cost Evaluation Study, a Benefits Valuation Study and a Non-Water Quality and Other Impacts Study. Until that time, the Permit requires, among other things, interim BTA practices (curtain wall, traveling screens, spray wash systems and debris return[37]), preventative measures to be identified in the Operations & Maintenance Manual, monitoring to be conducted "no less than weekly" during cooling water intake, and annual reports to DEQ concerning the effectiveness/efficiency of the facility's control measures as they affect

[33] 77 FR 5880, February 6, 2012. In June 2011, NOAA published its final rule listing several distinct population segments of the Atlantic Sturgeon, including the Chesapeake Bay DPS, as endangered species under the Endangered Species Act, but deferred, pending ongoing research, the identification of critical habitat for each DPS.
[34] https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2016/06/03/2016-12743/endangered-and-threatened-species-designation-of-critical-habitat-for-the-gulf-of-maine-new-york#h-11
[35] 16 U.S.C. § 1532(5)(A).
[36] See 40 C.F.R § 125.94.
[37] Permit at 34.

federally-listed threatened or endangered species, designated critical habitat, and fragile species or shellfish.

Recommendation #11:

In view of the listing of Atlantic Sturgeon, the pending regulatory process regarding critical habitat, and the extension of time proposed to be granted to CPS before it must comply with the revised BTA requirements of the federal rule, the draft Permit should be modified to require CPS (a) to undertake monitoring no less than every three days during operations of the cooling water intake (rather than weekly); and (b) to include in its annual report to DEQ on federally listed or endangered species a description of all steps taken in the reporting period to reduce the number of organisms taken by impingement, entrainment or other method.

VI. Ensuring Adequate Protection from Toxic Discharges

Virginia's work on Bay and watershed restoration has long featured a commitment to reducing or eliminating the dangerous and toxic chemicals that foul our waterways. Thus, a prominent goal in the *Chesapeake 2000* agreement was to achieve a Chesapeake Bay "free of toxics by reducing or eliminating the input of chemical contaminants from all controllable sources to levels that result in no toxic or bioaccumulative impact on the living resources that inhabit the Bay or on human health"[38]-- a goal that was to be achieved through striving for "zero release of chemical contaminants from point sources," with "[p[]particular emphasis . . . on achieving, by 2010, elimination of mixing zones for persistent or bioaccumulative toxics." The 2014 Chesapeake Watershed Agreement renewed this commitment with its goal to "ensure that the Bay and its rivers are free of effects of toxic contaminants on living resources and human health.[39]

These commitments underscore our concern that the Permit's proposed effluent limits on metals and other metals in the pond effluent may be insufficiently protective. A notable example is arsenic, with proposed limits of 240 mg/L monthly average and 440 mg/L daily maximum,[40] compared with freshwater water quality standards (aquatic life) of 340 mg/L (acute) and 150 (chronic).

We are also concerned that the Permit's requirements for testing the drawdown effluent for exceedances of limits on potentially toxic chemicals may be insufficient. With UAP drawdown expected to be complete within one month (3 months for LAP drawdown),[41] the draft Permit's requirement of only **monthly** Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) (Acute and Chronic) testing at Outfall 101 appears strikingly inadequate,[42] rendering meaningless the supposed ability of DEQ to confirm the safety of the discharge and halting it if warranted for safety concerns, through permit modification or revocation/reissuance.[43]

---

[38] http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/19193/chesapeake_2000.pdf
[39] http://www.chesapeakebay.net/chesapeakebaywatershedagreement/page
[40] *See* Permit, at 2-4 (limits for Outfall 101, during drawdown).
[41] Fact Sheet, at 5.
[42] *See* Permit I.C.17.b.(6) ("Frequency of Testing. Monthly testing is required as indicated in Part I.A.2 of this permit, beginning upon commencement of closure activities as defined in Part I.C.24.")
[43] See Permit, I.C.17.b (5).

Recommendation #12

The draft Permit's effluent limits for drawdown effluent should be reconsidered and lowered to provide adequate protection of the receiving waterways; and the Permit should also be modified (a) to require WET testing the day before drawdown commences; (b) to require WET testing no less than once per week throughout the drawdown period for the LAP and the UAP; and (c) to ensure that the results of the WET testing are made publicly available as soon as practicable after the test results are completed.

VII. Other Comments

Except to the extent inconsistent with the foregoing comments, we incorporate by reference the comments submitted by the Southern Environmental Law Center and the James River Association.

CONCLUSION

We are very appreciative of the opportunity to review, and provide our comments on, the draft VPDES Permit No. VA0004146 to be reissued for the Chesterfield Power Station. We would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Margaret L. (Peggy) Sanner
Virginia Assistant Director & Senior Attorney

cc: Rebecca LePrell – CBF VA Executive Director
Chris Moore – CBF VA Senior Scientist
Joseph Wood – CBF VA Staff Scientist